

Appl. No. 09/258,601
Amtd. Dated August 19, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 83315.0001
Customer No.: 53720

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims 1-20 have been previously canceled. Claims 21, 34, 37-39 and 51-53 are amended. Claims 21-54 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 24, 25 and 29 -34 were rejected as being anticipated by Gifford (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,776). Claims 22, 23, 26-28 and 35-54 were rejected as being obvious over Gifford in view of Pardo (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,539). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present application relates to a communication system which utilizes a database to associates network identification with telephone numbers and which allows a user to input a telephone number using a relatively simple input device without having to use a full keyboard. To emphasize this aspect of the invention, independent claims 21 and 34 are amended to recite entering an input "using an input device having a plurality of input elements arranged in a telephone keypad arrangement but without full alphabetic input elements". Such an input device is clearly described in the specification (see, for example, Figs. 10, 10A, 10B, 11 and 16 and accompanying text). This claim language is intended to include, for example, input devices that have ten numeric keys 0 - 9 and optionally * and # keys as typically used on a telephone keypad, and optionally a small number of other control keys, but exclude an input device that has a full alphabetic or alphanumeric keyboard or full alphabetic or alphanumeric input capabilities, as typically used with computers and PDAs.

By using a database that associates network identification with telephone numbers ("the first computer obtaining from a database a network identification of the information source based on the telephone number") and an input device as recited in claims 21 and 34, a user is able to access information on the network by

simply dialing a telephone number using a familiar, telephone keypad-style input device. The presently claimed invention and the advantageous functions offered by it are not achieved in the prior art devices, either taken alone or in combination.

The Gifford reference describes using a database that maps network addresses with telephone numbers. Gifford does not teach the use of an input device as presently claimed. The system described in Gifford is intended to be used with conventional computers with full alphanumeric keyboards. See Fig. 1 of Gifford.

The Pardo reference describes a telephone docking station for a PDA. This device is designed to “extend the PDA’s functionality to the telephone”. Software installed on the PDA implements communication functions such as dialing a phone number, sending and receiving email, browsing the Internet, three-way calling, call forwarding, etc. This device merely congregates these various communication functions into the docked PDA; it does not create any new communication functions such as accessing the Internet by dialing a telephone number.

There is no incentive to combine the Gifford reference with the Pardo reference to achieve a communication method as claimed in the present application. Clearly, the premise of the Pardo reference is that the telephone device itself is inconvenient for carrying out some of the communication functions, which is why a PDA (with its full key board and display) is docked with the telephone to carry out these functions. This is contrary to the goal of the present invention, which is to allow the user to access a network such as the Internet by entering telephone numbers using a simple input device that does not have a full alphabetic keyboard. Thus, Pardo in fact teaches away from the claimed invention.

In summary, while elements of the claimed invention, such as the database that associates network identification with telephone numbers, or a telephone keypad style input device, are described in the cited references, there is no

Appl. No. 09/258,601
Amdt. Dated August 19, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 20, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 83315.0001
Customer No.: 53720

suggestion, motivation or incentive to combine these elements to achieve the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, these references do not render claims 21 and 34 obvious. Claims 21 and 34, as well as their dependent claims 22-33 and 35-54, are patentable over the cited references.

The art made of record but not relied upon by the Examiner has been considered. However, it is submitted that this art neither describes nor suggests the presently claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested. The Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 625-5076 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there is any deficiency in fees in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-3531.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 19, 2005

By: 

Ying Chen
Registration No. 50,193
Attorney for Applicant

255 South Grand Avenue, #215
Los Angeles, California 90012
Phone: 213-625-5076
Fax: 213-625-0691